

In the Drawings:

Please replace the second sheet of the drawings with the attached replacement sheet.

Remarks

The above-referenced application has been reviewed in light of the Examiner's Office Action dated March 17, 2006. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 have been canceled; Claims 2-4, 7-9, 12-14 and 17-19 have been amended; and new Claims 21-24 have been added. Therefore, Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15 and 17-24 are currently pending in this application. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested, particularly in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

In accordance with the Office Action, Figure 2 drew an objection for an error of a generally typographical nature. Figure 2 has been amended to recite "Searchline Pipeline Logic & Driver" for the circuit block 30 in accordance with the Examiner's kind suggestion. No new matter has been added.

In accordance with the Office Action, the specification drew an objection for unclear, inexact or verbose terms. The specification has been revised to correct various errors of a generally grammatical nature. No new matter has been added.

In accordance with the Office Action, Claim 2 drew an objection for an informality. Claim 2 has been amended to correct the informality in accordance with the Examiner's kind suggestion. No new matter has been added.

In accordance with the Office Action, Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by United States Patent No. 6,804,134 to Proebsting et al. Claims 1, 6, 11 and 16 have been canceled. Claims 2, 7, 12 and 17 have been rewritten in independent form. The Examiner's rejection of Claims 2, 7, 12 and 17 is traversed.

Amended Claim 2 recites, *inter alia*, a “content addressable memory ... comprising a plurality of segments ... the wordline being shared by all of the cells in the same row, *the matchline and sinkline being shared by all of the cells in the same segment*” (*emphasis added*).

The ‘134 to Proebsting et al. is generally directed towards a ternary content addressable memory having array blocks. The Examiner has equated Proebsting’s “array blocks” with Applicants’ “segments”. Such reliance is misplaced. FIG. 3A of Proebsting is described beginning at col. 8, line 45. FIG. 3A shows an “array block”, which includes one pair of complimentary bit lines, a pseudo-ground line PGND6, and a *plurality of matchlines (i.e., MLINE6A, MLINE6B, MLINE6C and MLINE6A)*. Thus, Proebsting et al. fail to teach or suggest “*the matchline and sinkline being shared by all of the cells in the same segment*” as recited in Applicants’ amended Claim 2.

Therefore, amended Claim 2 is neither taught nor suggested by the ‘134 to Proebsting et al. Similarly, amended Claims 7, 12 and 17, which each recite like features, are also neither taught nor suggested by the ‘134 to Proebsting et al., whether taken alone or in combination with any of the other references of record in this case.

New Claims 21-24 have been added. The Examiner’s attention is drawn to the substantially same sized segments recited in new Claims 21-24. Support for new Claims 21-24 may be found in the specification as originally filed (see, e.g., page 4, lines 25-27). No new matter has been added. It is respectfully submitted that the ‘134 to Proebsting et al. not only fails to teach or suggest substantially same sized segments, but teaches away from such segment sizing by indicating that successive segments


should be larger than preceding segments (see, e.g., Proebsting at col. 12, lines 30-47; col. 15, lines 16-34).

Conclusion

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that independent Claims 2, 7, 12 and 17 are in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated above. Since Claims 3-5, 8-10, 13-15 and 18-24 each depend from one of the above claims and necessarily include each of the elements and limitations thereof, it is respectfully submitted that these claims are also in condition for allowance for at least the reasons stated, as well as for reciting additional patentable subject matter. Thus, each of Claims 2-5, 7-10, 12-15 and 17-24 is in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed, reconsideration of the rejections and an early and favorable allowance of this case are earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

By:


Eric M. Parham
Registration No. 45,747
Attorney for Applicants

Correspondence Address:

F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, New York 11797
Telephone: (516) 692-8888
Facsimile: (516) 692-8889